

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT,
PROPRIETOR.

Volume XXXVII.....No. 41

AMUSEMENTS THIS AFTERNOON AND EVENING.

WALLACK'S THEATRE, Broadway and 13th street.—
JOHN GARTER.NIBLO'S GARDEN, Broadway, between Prince and
Houston streets.—BLACK CROOK. Matinee at 2.BOWERY THEATRE, Bowery.—THE FORBES.—WILL
HATLEY. Matinee at 2.ST. JAMES' THEATRE, Twenty-eighth street and Broad-
way.—MONALDI. Matinee at 2.STADT THEATRE, Nos. 46 and 47 Bowery.—THE TEN-
PLEAR AND THE JEWELS.FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE, Twenty-fourth street.—
THE NEW DRAMA OF DIVORCE. Matinee at 1 1/2.OLYMPIC THEATRE, Broadway.—THE BALLET PAN-
TOMME OF HUMPTY DUMPTY. Matinee at 2.ROBERT'S THEATRE, Twenty-third street, corner 8th av.—
JULIUS CÆSAR. Matinee at 1.GLOBE THEATRE, 728 and 730 Broadway.—FREDERICK
ON, CUTE THE RELIABLE.GRAND OPERA HOUSE, corner of 8th av. and 33d st.—
EUROPEAN HIPPODROMATICAL COMPANY. Matinee at 2.ACADEMY OF MUSIC, Fourteenth street.—ENGLISH
OPERA.—THE WATER GARDEN. Matinee.WOOD'S MUSEUM, Broadway, corner 23d st.—Perform-
ances afternoon and evening.—JOS. HAND.MRS. F. R. CONWAY'S BROOKLYN THEATRE.—
MAN AND WIFE.PARK THEATRE, opposite City Hall, Brooklyn.—
DARLING DICK, THE BROOKLYN DETECTIVE.THEATRE COMIQUE, 614 Broadway.—COMIC VOCAL-
ISTS, NEGRO ACTS, &c.—DI-VORCE. Matinee at 2.UNION SQUARE THEATRE, Fourteenth street and Broad-
way.—NEGRO ACTS.—BERLSCHE, BALLY, &c. Matinee.THIRTY-FOURTH STREET THEATRE, near Third av.—
VARIETY ENTERTAINMENT. Matinee at 2.TONT PASTORS OPERA HOUSE, No. 201 Bowery.—
NEGRO SCENARIOS, BERLSCHE, &c. Matinee.BRYANT'S NEW OPERA HOUSE, 224 st., between 6th
and 7th avs.—BRYANT'S MINSTRELS. Matinee at 2.SAN FRANCISCO MINSTREL HALL, 555 Broadway.—
THE SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS.PAVILION, No. 688 Broadway.—THE VERNAL LADY OR-
CHESTRA. Matinee at 2 1/2.STEINWAY HALL, Fourteenth street.—Afternoon at 2—
GRAND CONCERT.ASSOCIATION HALL, 9th street and Third avenue.—
Matinee at 2 1/2—GRAND CONCERT.NEW YORK CIRCUS, Fourteenth street.—SOURCES IN
THE RING. ACTS, &c. Matinee.NEW YORK MUSEUM OF ANATOMY, 618 Broadway.—
SCIENCE AND ART.DR. KAHN'S ANATOMICAL MUSEUM, 745 Broadway.—
SCIENCE AND ART.

TRIPLE SHEET.

New York, Saturday, February 10, 1872.

CONTENTS OF TO-DAY'S HERALD.

PAGE.

1—Advertisements.

2—Advertisements.

3—Our Savings Banks: What the State Legisla-
ture Proposed to Do About Them; Text of the
General Act for Their Regulation and Con-
duct; Stringent Provisions as to Liability of
Directors and the Investments Made by the
Banks; How Fraud and Abuse are Pre-
vented and Depositors Protected Against Loss;
The Bill the Poor Man's Friend and the
Hon. Rich. B. Austin's Address to the Senate
in Mexico—European Cable Telegrams—The
Mikado's Representatives: The Japanese
"Ginny" Camp Douglas—News from Wash-
ington.4—The State Capital: More Charters for the Me-
tropolitan: Re-openers of all Sorts from New
York and Brooklyn: A Year's Commemorative
Commission for the Port of New York: A
Railroad for Fifth Avenue: The Senatorial
Committee on Corruption—Congress: Acri-
tious Debate in the Senate: The Amend-
ment to the Constitution: A Joint Session
Representing Sixty Million Dollars, Six Mil-
lions to Begin With—Bertha's Raid on the Har-
bor—How Shots—Locomotive Explosion—
Music and the Drama.5—Canadian Independence: A Rumored Secret
Treaty of Separation Between Great Britain
and Canada—Foreseeing What the United
States—The Dominion, in Case of Trouble, To
Be Declared Free from British Authority—Abol-
ition of the Council of Ministers—New Political
Departments and Reform in All Public Depart-
ments—The Popular Paroxysm: Opinions of
the People on the Approach of the Senate
England—The Fenians Again: A Proclama-
tion from the "Irish Confederation"—Art
Notes—A Postal Grievance—The Aggrieved
Gas Consumers—Brooklyn—The "Strangers"
Hospital—Nominations for Mayor of Bingham-
ton.6—Editorials: Leading Article, "England and
France and the Southern Confederacy: Our
Settlement with France and Our Settlement
as Agreed Upon With England"—Amusement
Amusements.7—Editorials (Continued from Sixth Page)—The
Washington Treaty: A Stiffed Debate in the
Senate on England's Attitude—The Senate
Dignified and Golden; Secretary Fish's
Diplomatic Reply to Earl Granville; His-
tory of the Bill; The Bill's Passage—The
Rumors of a Course Before the Geneva Arbitra-
tors Plain and Unquestionable; British Pro-
fession of Fidelity to the Treaty; British Aris-
tocratic Support of the Treaty—The
American Feeling in Liverpool; Commissioner
Adams and the United States Jurists in Mon-
rovia; War Issues on American Vessels in the
East—American Securities on the Frankfurt
House—The War in Mexico: A Battle
Fought and Won by the Revolutionists; Total
Ruin of Juárez's Trade; The Insurgents Cap-
tured by the Insurgents—Business Notices.8—The Custom House Committee: Further Reve-
lations of the Committee: The Committee's
Government Sales: Adjournment of the Inves-
tigation to Washington: The Methodist Book
Concern—Miller's Insurance Record—Arrest
of a Dating Thief—The Surrogate Bank De-
positors: A Clever Capture: How a Shrewd
Owner Overhauled a Coachload of Burglars
and Their Loot—The Former Husband of
Josephine Mansfield Interviewed—Judge Bed-
ford's Grand Jury—Around the City Hall—
More Reform—Political Movements and
Views—Pacific Mail Investigation: Race
Revelations of Stock-Jobbing Operations—An
Ungrateful Son.9—The National Bank Ring: Secret Meetings of
the Bankers and Currency Committee—
A Burglar Caught in the Act—The New York
Provident and Society—Jewelry's "Trap"—A
Fugitive's Awful Fate—Financial and com-
mercial Reports—Cattle Market—Domestic Mar-
kets—Marriages and Deaths.10—European Mail Details: The College of the
City of New York—Miscellaneous Telegrams—
Shipping Intelligence—Advertisements.11—The Courts: Interesting Proceedings in the
United States Supreme, New York City and
Brooklyn Courts: The Jewel Estate Case: A
Custom House Case: Verdict Against the Gov-
ernment: Action on a Note: Decision—"Shoot-
ing in a Hall Room—Burglars at Work—Official
Proceedings of the Boards of Aldermen and
Assistant Aldermen—Advertisements.

12—Advertisements.

13—Advertisements.

14—Advertisements.

15—Advertisements.

16—Advertisements.

17—Advertisements.

18—Advertisements.

19—Advertisements.

20—Advertisements.

21—Advertisements.

22—Advertisements.

23—Advertisements.

24—Advertisements.

25—Advertisements.

26—Advertisements.

27—Advertisements.

28—Advertisements.

29—Advertisements.

30—Advertisements.

31—Advertisements.

32—Advertisements.

33—Advertisements.

34—Advertisements.

35—Advertisements.

36—Advertisements.

37—Advertisements.

38—Advertisements.

39—Advertisements.

40—Advertisements.

41—Advertisements.

42—Advertisements.

43—Advertisements.

44—Advertisements.

45—Advertisements.

46—Advertisements.

47—Advertisements.

48—Advertisements.

49—Advertisements.

50—Advertisements.

51—Advertisements.

52—Advertisements.

53—Advertisements.

54—Advertisements.

55—Advertisements.

56—Advertisements.

57—Advertisements.

58—Advertisements.

59—Advertisements.

60—Advertisements.

—Land and France and the "Southern
Confederacy"—Our Settlement with France
and Our Settlement as Agreed Upon
with England.

It is not surprising that the "American case" on the Alabama claims, as submitted to the Geneva Court of Arbitration, has awakened a profound excitement and great indignation in England touching the infernal and consequential damages involved. It is not surprising, because Englishmen had generally accepted the Treaty of Washington as embracing the abandonment of all indirect claims in the premises on the part of the United States; and because the acts, the facts, the dates and specifications, with the argument thereon, submitted in our case, are fearfully strong, not only in behalf of consequential damages, but in support of the American opinion that England's neutrality in our late rebellion, from the beginning to the end, was but a thin disguise covering an active alliance with Jeff Davis.

In the course of the argument of the American case, after reciting the several treaties between the two countries from 1814 to 1864, and the numerous concessions made on the part of the United States from time to time in behalf of peace and relations of close friendship with England, it is said that, when threatened with our Southern rebellion, the United States had "a right to feel confident that in any controversy which might grow out of the unhappy existence of African slavery in certain of the Southern States the British government would not exercise its sovereign powers questionably or unquestionably in favor of the supporters of slavery." Down to the month of May, 1861, this was the almost universal opinion throughout our loyal States. It was an opinion naturally resulting from the activity with which English abolitionists and the British government had supported for twenty-five or thirty years the abolition agitation in this country. After all the services in this cause of the notorious Thompson and other English emissaries; after all the books of English travellers on American barbarisms, including the horrible atrocities of American slavery, from Mrs. Trollope down to Charles Dickens, and after the defection in England of William Lloyd Garrison and the astonished authoress of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," our Northern people to the last moment scouted the idea that between the United States and a rebellious Southern confederacy, founded on "the corner stone of negro slavery," England would take the side of slavery.

But she did, and with an indecent haste and with a shameless audacity, in Lord John Russell's proclamation of belligerent rights, which we could not at first understand, because at first we could not believe it to be true. We were soon convinced, however, that, not only were the sympathies and the moral support of the British government and the British aristocracy pledged to the so-called Confederate States, but that Lord Palmerston and Russell were only waiting for a convenient pretext to become an active ally of Jeff Davis. It was made clear, from Russell's belligerent proclamation, that England's active philanthropy in reference to American slavery had had for its object, not the emancipation of our Southern slaves, but the dissolution of the great American republic and the overthrow of its popular institutions, so dangerous to the "divine rights of kings" and feudal aristocracies. The sectional division of this Union on slavery to the issue of war, for which England had been working for a quarter of a century and more, had come at last, and, with the organization of the Southern Confederacy at Montgomery, Alabama, and before a gun had been fired to break the peace between the North and South, England took the position that this Union was dissolved; that the Southern Confederacy was a fixed fact, and that a convenient pretext would soon enable her to settle the question.

The *entente cordiale* cemented between Lord Palmerston and Louis Napoleon in the war of the Crimea enabled the former, without difficulty, to unite France with England in this matter of belligerent rights. Nor was Napoleon behind hand in his confidence in our Southern Confederacy; and he, too, had his grand designs in gathering his share of the rich fruits that would be offered to England and France from the dissolution of the great American Union. To England, with the success of our gigantic rebellion, would fall the monopoly, on her own terms, of our Southern cotton trade; and between the Northern and the Southern Confederacy she could hold both subject to her good will and pleasure. Above all, with the collapse of this republic the crown and the aristocracy of England would be established as on a rock for, perhaps, centuries to come. Louis Napoleon, with an eye to the ultimate restoration to France of the outlets of the Mississippi and the command of its great traffic, and to the appropriation of California, saw that his way was conveniently open through Mexico. He took military possession of that country—our hands being tied; he established his Austrian instrument, the accomplished Maximilian, over it, on the French system, as Emperor, "by the will of the Mexican people," and he awaited the issue of our civil war for the further development of his plans. But General Grant spoiled all his calculations, and so Mr. Secretary Seward at length obtained a hearing in the Tuileries, and Napoleon, taking the hint, wisely withdrew from Mexico, but cruelly left poor Maximilian to the tender mercies of Juárez.

That was the settlement with France of our outstanding balances against her growing out of our terrible struggle of life or death with our insurgent States. England's belligerent rights and perfidious neutrality in the very first year of the war were brought out in their true colors. Waiting only and watching for a pretext to join hands with Jeff Davis, the vigilant Palmerston and Russell, in November, 1861, found it, and joyfully seized it, in the Trent affair. A British steamer, the Trent, with James M. Mason, of Virginia, and John Slidell on board, the one as Minister of the Confederate States to England, and the other as Minister from said States to France, and each accompanied by his Secretary, had left Bermuda en route for England. Not far from Bermuda the Trent was overhauled by the United States war steamer San Jacinto, Captain Wilkes, and by him the four men indicated were taken off and carried to Fortress

Monroe. The act was heartily applauded by the people of our loyal States and they were ready to meet the consequences. Mr. Seward, however, saw that it was a blunder and volunteered at once the needful explanation to England. But before he could communicate with London Her Majesty's government had sent a peremptory demand for the release of Mason and Slidell, backed by the iron-clad Warrior and other warlike preparations, and in making up its answer our government was limited to seven days—only seven days' grace.

Here was a deliberate attempt to thrust the issue of war upon us; for in every respect this British demand was purposely framed not to invite an apology, but to provoke a fight. It was like spitting in the face of a defenceless man, while denouncing him as a thief. But President Lincoln had resolved to be content with "one war at the time," and to bear with any affront from England or France until he had settled with Davis. The apology demanded was accordingly made within the seven days' grace allowed, and, failing in their game, Her Majesty's Cabinet and aristocracy, and Davis and all his Confederates were grievously disappointed. But this solution of the Trent affair in the hearts of millions of Americans was laid by as a rod in pickle for the day of atonement, and it is properly in, and could not with a becoming respect for the truth of history be left out of the "American case" before the Geneva arbitrators. To be sure, England's apology in the Treaty of Washington covers a multitude of sins; but it does not embrace this Trent affair, nor the consequential damages from the boldness which it gave to British blockade runners and to Mr. Laird & Co. in the building of rebel piratical cruisers. The British speculators, political and financial, in blockade runners, rebel ships-of-war and Confederate cotton loans came out with their money and supplies of all kinds to the enemy, without stint, after the Trent affair, because, from our unexpected apology, they were satisfied that "England could not kick the Yankees into a fight," and that "the Southerners would whip them."

Accepting, however, England's apology as covering all the indignities and moral offences against us of which she was guilty in connection with our late rebellion, our case as laid before the Geneva arbitrators is still fair as a bill of damages in dollars and cents. It is not for Mr. Gladstone but for the Court to decide the extent to which our claims are valid or inadmissible. The Court is the interpreter of the treaty between the two parties. Nor can England withdraw from this tribunal, in failing to secure the abatements demanded in our case, without losing all she has gained in her apology. She violates her apology by breaking the agreement of which it is a part, and she leaves us to the alternative of settling with her as we settled with Louis Napoleon.

Prince Bismarck on Public Education.

Prince Bismarck defined the position of the German government on the question of public education in a speech which he addressed to the members of the Prussian Diet yesterday. The Premier was considerably excited, particularly with reference to the point of denominational religious instruction. He said, according to our cable telegram, that the Emperor's government "was disposed to propitiate the Roman Catholics, but its patience was exhausted." He added, in conclusion, that "it will be the policy of Prussia hereafter to Germanize the Polish schools as France had Gallicized those of Alsace and Lorraine." The Premier Prince was evidently angered, and that to a very considerable degree, when he permitted his opponents in the Legislature to force him to reveal himself towards Poland, and to exhibit the bitter feeling which has been engendered in his mind by the sight of the returned descendants of the first German inhabitants of Alsace and Lorraine, after their education by the foreign conqueror. The French endeavored to prove that Slavonic Teutonism is not indestructible, and they came very near to success. They must now pay for their ethnological experiment, and that at a very dear rate, according to the avengement principle of Bismarck's interpretation of the maxim, *Fas est ab hoste doceri*. Poland will buffer also, and the Papal interests in the Prussian provinces of the ancient kingdom be subjected to the influence of the *lex talionis* of Bismarck.

Reform in the Law Regulating Savings Banks.

The Banking Committee of the State Legislature has agreed upon a bill to regulate savings banks, the provisions of which will be found in full in the HERALD to-day. The proposed new law seeks to make more stringent provisions in regard to the loaning of deposits by a savings bank, and throws other safeguards around the depositors' money which recent experience has shown to be greatly needed. The trustees are held to greater responsibility than at present, and the means of reaching dishonest managers are rendered more speedy and certain. Some reform is required in this direction, for nothing is more unjust, cruel and impolitic than a system which renders the hard earned money of the poor an easy prey to dishonest and more beneficial duty to perform than to encourage the laboring classes in the habit of saving while health and vigor are on their side. Every failure of a savings bank, every exposure of fraud in such an institution, does more mischief by means of its disheartening effect upon its victims than through the immediate loss it may entail upon them. If the bill upon scrutiny promises to make the deposits in these banks more secure than at present it should be passed without a dissentient voice.

MARSHAL BAZAINE'S "treachery to the French republic" has been made patent to the committee of the Legislative Assembly which is investigating the subject of the surrender of fortresses to the Prussians during the late war. So says the *Paris Patrie*. The Marshal is really unfortunate. He fought against the popular idea in Algeria, fought against republican institutions in Mexico, and now he is accused of having betrayed the national interests as a soldier and a Frenchman. Can it be possible? Does military life ever induce such personal demoralizations? We can scarcely believe it.

The System of State Taxation—The Report of the Committee of Revision.

The report of the Commissioners appointed by the Governor to revise the laws for assessment and collection of taxes in the State, have submitted their report, which has been laid before the Legislature. It is an exhaustive document, of much interest to the people, but its extreme length has prevented its publication in the HERALD. It has long been admitted that our tax system is very defective, and that a radical change in existing laws is desirable, both to effect a more equal and perfect assessment of real estate and to remove the serious objections that exist in regard to the taxation of personal property. The Committee have evidently performed their labor with diligence and intelligence, and if all their suggestions do not receive popular approval, they have at least succeeded in making more clear and distinct the defects in our present laws, and in affording the Legislature many useful practical suggestions for their amendment.

Every taxpayer is interested in securing an equal and fair assessment of real estate for the purpose of taxation. It is a fallacy for any owner of property to suppose that he is saving money if he has succeeded, by favoritism or sharp practice, in securing an undervaluation. The defective system that enables him to do this gives his neighbors an equal opportunity to evade a genuine assessment. If the whole real estate in New York, in the cities and in the country, were assessed at its actual value, the percentage of taxation would be less than it is, even in cases where property is greatly undervalued. The Commissioners seek to strike at this fundamental evil of unequal and insufficient valuation by proposing in the new code of tax laws submitted with their report such stringent provisions as will, in their belief, serve to secure the enforcement of the rule that all real estate shall be assessed throughout the State at its real market value. New York city, which bears a large share of the burden of general taxation, suffers the greatest injustice under the present system, because property here is assessed much nearer to its market value than is property in other parts of the State. From 1861 to 1870 the increased valuation of the State reached forty-seven and a half per cent, but nearly all this was realized in the cities of New York and Brooklyn. Excluding the two counties of New York and Kings, the increase would only have been eight and a half per cent; yet the increase of population in the other parts of the State was almost as great as in these two counties during the same period. The lowest point of valuation is found in some farm lands, and in some instances it is down to fourteen per cent of the actual market value of the property. The average valuation all over the State for assessment is but forty per cent of the actual value.

That a reform is needed in this direction must be evident to all, and, as we have said, every taxpayer would be benefited by a full and uniform valuation, as the average percentage would be thereby greatly reduced. The new laws proposed by the committee might, and probably would, secure that desirable object; at all events they are deserving of attentive consideration, coming from able men, who have carefully examined the subject and are earnest in the work they have undertaken. In regard to the efforts to tax personal property, under existing laws, the committee speak out boldly and distinctly. The attempt has been farcical and disgraceful, and the evidence of its failure, they declare, is most conclusive. A strong array of facts and elaborate reasoning support this proposition, and the Commissioners arrive at the conclusion that the present system of personal taxation is a violation of the principles of constitutional government. Without following them through their argument, we may say that the existing taxation of personal property is universally known to be a farce. The system is unequal, unjust and inefficient as well as arbitrary and inquisitorial, and the people would be glad to see it abolished altogether rather than continue in its present shape. Still, personal property should bear its just share of the public burdens, and the propositions of the Commissioners are that all moneyed corporations of every kind shall be taxed in accordance with the present laws, and that every occupier of a dwelling or building shall pay a tax upon three times the actual rental value of his premises in lieu of any taxation of personal property, as at present existing. The Commissioners argue to show that this is a fair estimate of a man's personal wealth, and assert that wherever high rentals prevail—in great business or fashionable localities—the largest amount of personal property is represented. We can see many objections that may be made to this novel proposition, especially in a crowded city where the rental of moderate-sized houses and stores in respectable but not first class locations are likely to be unduly high as compared with more valuable property; but the subject is so important as to deserve more careful and thorough consideration than we can now bestow upon it. The report is an interesting and valuable document, and will, no doubt, be carefully studied by the Legislature and by the taxpayers generally.

The French Assembly and the Army Contractors.

The French Legislative Assembly has become exceedingly suspicious of the morality and honesty of the war contract system as it is observed under the government. The members are to ask information from Washington on the subject of a recent inquiry into the conduct of "American officials who were suspected of participating in the purchase of arms for the French government during the war." The news telegram is not very clear as to what the French committee is just exactly seeking after. Does France, as a grand military and war-making nation, imagine that all military contractors are scrupulously honest? If so she has forgotten the lessons and experiences of the great Bonaparte, who, when he came to levy the national taxes—under the famous Code Napoleon—and, glancing along the columns of the returns containing the names and occupations of those liable, found the definition of profession to be "contractor for the army," wrote the simple but decisive words, "Let him disgorge freely to the State." The French Assembly is puzzling itself about a variety of matters—some of them trides in the end.

Congress Yesterday—The Amnesty Bill Defeated—The Proposed Revocation of the Alabama Treaty.

The Senate has at last come to a final issue on the Amnesty bill, and the bill is dead. It was killed by Sumner's supplementary Civil Rights bill, which was tacked on to it as an amendment, by the casting vote of Vice President Colfax. Many of the most prominent republican Senators voted against Sumner's amendment, including Carpenter, of Wisconsin; Ferry, of Connecticut; Logan and Trumbull, of Illinois; Morrill, of Maine; Robertson and Sawyer, of South Carolina; Schurz, of Missouri, and Scott, of Pennsylvania. It was a tie vote—28 to 28—and the amendment was, therefore, defeated had not Mr. Colfax exercised his prerogative to give the casting vote, and given it for the amendment, while confessing plainly enough that he did not approve of it. Neither do we think that the people will approve of it, or of his course in thus aiding in the assassination of amnesty—not only aiding in it, but dealing the fatal blow at it with his own hand. It was not a party measure, and there was, therefore, the less excuse for Mr. Colfax's action. After that the fate of the bill was sealed. If there had not been votes enough in the Senate to kill it, it could never have got through the House with the negro equality amendment tacked on to it; but it did not even get through the Senate. Enough republicans voted with the democrats to prevent the bill getting the requisite two-thirds majority. The vote stood 33 to 19 less than two-thirds in the affirmative, and the bill was rejected.

There is now one way left for Congress to get rid of this difficult question and to remove the irritation which must result in the South over the defeat of this measure. We appeal from Mr. Sumner, in the Senate, to Mr. Dawes, in the House—from Massachusetts drunk to Massachusetts sober. Let Mr. Dawes, the leader of the House, introduce next Monday, and have passed, under a suspension of the rules, a short, simple bill of universal and unconditional amnesty, and have it again sent to the Senate. That body will be, at that time, we are sure, so ashamed of its subservience to Sumner and his cohorts that it will consent to come to a square vote on such a bill, backed, as it will be, by the influence of the administration. The President is not responsible for the continuance of political disabilities in the South, and is too much of a soldier and statesman not to appreciate thoroughly the danger at such a time of keeping alive discontent among the leading men of the South. He knows that what Ireland is to England, as a source of apprehension and danger in case of war, the Southern States are to this government, only in a still greater degree on account of the military character of the people of the South. If England dare not go to war with us from the danger she would expose herself to from Ireland, still less dare we to go to war with England, knowing how easily she could fan the discontent of the South into a new rebellion, which, with the aid of England, might defy all our power to subdue. This consideration does not seem to have entered into the minds of the Senators who most bitterly opposed amnesty, and who yet, with reckless inconsistency, uttered words of bravado in the Senate on account of England's proposed revocation of the Alabama Treaty; for that subject was again in the Senate yesterday and evoked a discussion which, in spite of all professions of a desire to keep it within the bounds of respect and moderation, frequently trenching upon the limits of international courtesy and was calculated to embitter rather than to mollify the ill feeling to which the episode has given rise in both countries.

There were no questions of a public character before the House yesterday. By the rules of that body Fridays are assigned to bills of a private character, and such only occupied its attention yesterday. One of these was of considerable general interest, being a proposition to compensate the ancient College of William and Mary, in Virginia, for the destruction of its property during the war by the act of some drunken and insubordinate stragglers from the United States Army. No result was arrived at when the House adjourned.

The Senate will not be in session to-day and the House will only be in session for buncombe debate.

Mr. Boutwell on Reviving American Shipbuilding.

Mr. Boutwell has been giving his views on the subject of reviving American shipbuilding and the maritime interests of the country before the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives. He proposes to restore our commercial marine by a gigantic scheme of bounties. He has always been a bounty man, and after this he should be called the great bounty Secretary. The plan he recommends would involve the payment of fifty millions of dollars at least out of the Treasury for bounties to shipbuilders. For one class of vessels only—ocean steamships—he proposes to pay ten dollars per ton a year for five years, on an aggregate of five hundred thousand tons, which would amount to twenty-five millions of dollars. Then there is proposed a bounty of eight dollars a ton on sailing vessels not less than four hundred tons burden and six dollars a ton on vessels of not less than one hundred tons burden for either the foreign or coast trade, besides indirect bounties to fishing vessels. Fifty millions would be the lowest amount, probably, thus taken from the pockets of the taxpayers. But that would not be the only evil of such a measure. The doors would be opened by this precedent to all sorts of bounties and jobs, by which the mass of the people would be taxed for the benefit of special interests. Away with such bad policy and dangerous precedent. The proper way to increase our tonnage and to revive our maritime and commercial interests is to let American capitalists buy ships in the cheapest and best markets and to nationalize the ships so purchased.

THE LYNNBURG *Virginian* regards the liberal republican movement as one of the most hopeful auguries of the times, and adds that it suggests the only basis upon which all the opponents of radical rule can be brought together and co-operate with harmony. This is pessimism from an unexpected quarter.

Naval Economy—The Abolition of the Grade of Commodore.

The economical epidemic afflicting our National Legislature seems manifested with peculiar virulence in regard to the interests of the navy. Appropriations for expenditure here are reduced to the lowest limit consistent with the mere existence of the service, and our Congressmen are upon this subject apparently emulous of the experiment which proposed to demonstrate that, under a judicious system of diet, an animal might be educated to subsist upon a single straw per day.

Pursuant to this laudable purpose of national thrift, it is now proposed to abolish the grade of Commodore in the navy, to effect a small saving in the yearly appropriation for navy pay and rations. The scheme will not find much favor in naval circles, and it is questionable if the public, when it understands, will approve a measure which, under a pitiful pretence of economy, may inflict serious injury upon the efficiency of an important organization. Though—as the Secretary of the Navy states—it may be there are no duties performed by the grade of Commodore which cannot be as well performed by other grades; and though it may be that if any grade must be abolished, that of Commodore can be best spared without materially affecting the efficiency of the service; it is, nevertheless, the fact that in 1862 the grades of Rear Admiral and Commodore were established to remedy a recognized deficiency, and by this means round the official "personnel" of the navy into adequate completion.

That either military or naval power, to be efficient, should be wielded by a single individual head, is indisputable; it is a military necessity. And the distribution of power and responsibility from the head, through successively subordinated grades of members to the extremities, becomes a natural and inevitable consequence. Military men agree in the plan of construction of a grand army. A general-in-chief, major generals commanding army corps and divisions, brigadier generals conducting brigades, colonels in charge of regiments and battalions. Though these grades may be sometimes unoccupied, and the duties of either performed by subordinates, it is none the less true that when this is so there is an imperfection; a link of the chain is wanting, and the army lacks by this much the first element of efficiency—a complete organization. The same reasoning applies to the navy, in which the grade of Commodore is equivalent to that of Brigadier in the army and equally essential.

Even were the grade of Commodore superfluous, it is always injudicious to alter established systems, whose various constituents have become harmoniously adjusted, and where the change may seriously affect individual interests and aspirations. Next to patriotism and devotion to the service and the flag the leading idea with most naval officers is promotion as reward for efficient and faithful performance of duty. The future of many subordinate officers, their domestic establishment and hope of a home, hinge upon the anticipation of advancement in rank, bringing with it the pay enabling them to support a family. When it is considered that the abolition of the grade of commodore necessitates the suspension, for eight years, of all promotion, it becomes evident that this measure of economy bears hard upon those to whom the question is practically one of "bread and butter," and certainly cannot be approved by those liberal minded citizens who recognize the propriety of stimulating activity, energy and efficiency by the inducement of a coveted reward. It has been observed that in 1862 the grade of commodore was created to remedy a deficiency. The number of captains and commanders was then expressly reduced that the aggregate number of officers in the senior grades might not be increased. There were then sixty-eight captains and ninety-seven commanders. There are now fifty captains and ninety commanders. If the grade of commodore is abolished the fifty captains are manifestly too few for their present duties, and to fill all the other positions now filled by commodores, and it would then seem necessary, with the extinction of the grade of commodore, to re-establish the number of captains and commanders as existing before the war. If, of the number in the grade of commodore (twenty-five), eighteen be added to the present number of captains and seven to that of commanders, the numbers in these two grades will be exactly re-established—viz., sixty-eight captains and ninety-seven commanders—and thus the change may be effected without stopping promotion, which does a positive injustice to officers who have served faithfully from thirty to thirty-five years.

But this will not effect what Congress desires—economy in naval expenditure—as the increase by addition to these subordinate grades on the one hand will about equal the retrenchment accomplished by reduction on the other. Since, therefore, this proposed economy cannot be attained without inflicting hardship and injustice; and since, but for economy, there seems no motive for change in the present completed organization, it may be well for our legislators to direct their attention to other branches of naval expense where reformation is seriously demanded, and where a much more creditable economy can be judiciously devised.

A REAL BATTLE has at last been fought and won by the revolutionists in Mexico. According to our special despatch from Matamoros,